arXiv:1610.05680v1 [math.AP] 18 Oct 2016

# Rotationally corrected scaling invariant solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations

Zachary Bradshaw and Tai-Peng Tsai

**Abstract**

We introduce new classes of solutions to the three dimensional Navier-Stokes equations in the whole and half spaces that add rotational correction to self-similar and discretely self-similar solutions. We construct forward solutions in these new classes for arbitrarily large initial data in $L^3_w$ on the whole and half spaces. We also comment on the backward case.

## 1 Introduction

The 3D Navier-Stokes equations in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ read

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t v - \Delta v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla \pi = 0 \\ &\nabla \cdot v = 0 \end{aligned} \qquad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty), \tag{1.1}$$

and are supplemented with the initial condition

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0,$$

where $v_0 : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is given and satisfies $\nabla \cdot v_0 = 0$. If $\Omega$ possesses a boundary $\partial\Omega$ with outernormal $\nu$, then we require

$$v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \qquad v_0 \cdot \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

In this paper, $\Omega$ is either the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ or the half space $\mathbb{R}^3_+ = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3, x_3 > 0\}$.

Solutions to (1.1) satisfy a natural scaling: given a solution $v$ and $\lambda > 0$, it follows that

$$v^\lambda(x,t) = \lambda v(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \tag{1.2}$$

is also a solution with associated pressure

$$\pi^\lambda(x,t) = \lambda^2 \pi(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \tag{1.3}$$

and initial data

$$v_0^\lambda(x) = \lambda v_0(\lambda x). \tag{1.4}$$

Leray introduced self-similar solutions to (1.1) in [17]. A solution is *self-similar* (SS) if

$$v^\lambda(x,t) = v(x,t) \tag{1.5}$$

for every $\lambda > 0$. The solutions considered by Leray are called *backward* since they are defined for $-\infty < t < 0$. We will consider *forward* solutions defined for $0 < t < \infty$. If the scale invariance (1.5) holds for a particular $\lambda > 1$, not necessarily for every $\lambda > 1$, then we say $v$ is *discretely self-similar* with factor $\lambda$, i.e. $v$ is $\lambda$-DSS. The initial data $v_0$ is SS or $\lambda$-DSS if the appropriate scaling invariance holds with the time variable omitted.

The existence for SS/DSS solutions for *small* initial data follows from the unique existence theory of *mild solutions* in various scaling invariant functional spaces, see [8, 12, 2, 5, 14]. The theory for large data is more recent: Jia and Sverak established the first large data existence result in [10] for self-similar data which is Hölder continuous on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 0$. It is based on a priori Hölder estimates near initial time for *local Leray solutions* introduced by Lemarié-Rieusset in [16] (see also [13]), and is extended by Tsai [22] to construct $\lambda$-DSS solutions under the assumption that $\lambda$ is close to 1, or if the data is axisymmetric with no swirl. A second construction is obtained by Korobkov and Tsai [15], which is valid in the half space as well as the whole space, and is based on the a priori $H^1$ estimate obtained by Leray's method of contradiction and the triviality of $H^1_0$-solutions of Euler equations. Note that the first construction [10, 22] does not work in the half space, while the second construction [15] does not work for DSS solutions. A third construction of the authors [4] constructs SS and $\lambda$-DSS solutions for any data in $L^3_w$ (i.e., weak $L^3$ defined in (1.30)) and, in the DSS case, any $\lambda > 1$. It is based on a new a priori energy estimate, particular to the associated Leray equations to be introduced in (1.20) (not available to Navier-Stokes equations (1.1)), and is a weak solution theory using the Galerkin approximation, not the Leray-Schauder theorem used in [10, 22, 15]. Although it is stated only for the whole space in [4], its method works also for the half space, as will be made apparent as a special case of this article.

The purpose of this article is to introduce and investigate a new class of solutions with scaling properties resembling those of SS or DSS solutions *modulo rotational corrections*. There is a rich literature on fluids surrounding *rotating obstacles*, see the survey [9]. For ease of notation, we will only consider rotations around the $x_3$-axis with matrices

$$R_s = R(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(s) & -\sin(s) & 0 \\ \sin(s) & \cos(s) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note $R(s)R(\tau) = R(\tau)R(s)$ for any $s, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\frac{d}{ds}R(s) = JR(s) = R(s)J, \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A vector field $v(x,t)$ is said to be *rotated self-similar* (RSS) if, for some fixed

$\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and for *all* $\lambda > 0$,

$$v(x,t) = \lambda R(-2\alpha \log \lambda)\, v\big(\lambda R(2\alpha \log \lambda)x, \lambda^2 t\big)\,, \quad \forall x, \forall t, \forall \lambda. \tag{1.6}$$

The constant $\alpha$ will be called the *angular speed*, relative to the new time variable $s$ to be defined in (1.19). An RSS vector field is always DSS with any factor $\lambda > 1$ such that $2\alpha \log \lambda \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. When $\alpha = 0$ it becomes SS. The choice $\theta(\lambda) = 2\alpha \log \lambda$ in the argument of $R(\cdot)$ is natural because $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary and hence we need

$$\theta(\lambda) + \theta(\mu) = \theta(\lambda\mu), \quad \forall \lambda, \mu > 0. \tag{1.7}$$

Setting $\lambda = t^{-1/2}$, the RSS vector field $v$ satisfies

$$v(x,t) = R(\alpha \log t)\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\, v\left(R(-\alpha \log t)\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}}, 1\right), \quad \forall x, \forall t. \tag{1.8}$$

Thus the value of $v$ is determined by its value at any fixed time, and given any profile at a fixed time we can construct an RSS vector field.

A vector field $v(x,t)$ is said to be *rotated discretely self-similar* (RDSS) if, for some $\lambda > 1$ (not necessarily all $\lambda > 1$) and some $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v(x,t) = \lambda R(-\phi)\, v\big(\lambda R(\phi)x, \lambda^2 t\big)\,, \quad \forall x, \forall t. \tag{1.9}$$

We call $\lambda$ the *factor* and $\phi$ the *phase*. When $\phi \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ we recover $\lambda$-DSS vector fields. If $n\phi = 2\pi m$ for some integers $n > 0$ and $m$, then $v$ is DSS with factor $\lambda^n$. If $\frac{\phi}{2\pi}$ is irrational, in general $v$ is not DSS. For any $t > 0$ let $\tau(t) \in [1, \lambda^2)$ satisfy $\tau = \lambda^{2k} t$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then,

$$v(x,t) = \lambda^k R(-k\phi)\, v\big(\lambda^k R(k\phi)x, \tau\big)\,,$$

i.e., $v$ is decided entirely by its values on $t \in [1, \lambda^2)$. Note that an RSS vector field with angular speed $\alpha$ is always RDSS for any factor $\lambda > 1$ with phase $\phi = 2\alpha \log \lambda$.

In summary, the inclusions between these classes are

$$\text{SS} \subsetneq \text{RSS} \subsetneq \text{DSS} \subsetneq \text{RDSS}.$$

Similar to SS/DSS vector fields, these vector fields are also called *forward* if they are defined for $0 < t < \infty$, or *backward* if they are defined for $-\infty < t < 0$. They are called *stationary* if they are time-independent.

A vector field $v_0(x) : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is RSS if for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v_0(x) = \lambda R(-2\alpha \log \lambda) v_0\left(\lambda R(2\alpha \log \lambda)x\right), \quad \forall x, \forall \lambda, \tag{1.10}$$

and is RDSS if for some $\lambda > 1$ and some $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v_0(x) = \lambda R(-\phi) v_0\left(\lambda R(\phi)x\right), \quad \forall x. \tag{1.11}$$

Setting $\lambda = |x|^{-1}$, an RSS $v_0$ satisfies

$$v_0(x) = \frac{1}{|x|} R(2\alpha \log |x|)\, v_0\left(R(-2\alpha \log |x|)\frac{x}{|x|}\right). \tag{1.12}$$

Thus the value of $v_0$ is determined by its values on the unit sphere. Similarly, if $v_0$ is RDSS, then it is determined by its values on $\{x : 1 \le |x| < \lambda\}$. Clearly, if $\lim_{t\searrow 0} v(x,t) = v_0(x)$ and $v(x,t)$ satisfies (1.6) (resp. (1.9)), then $v_0(x)$ satisfies (1.10) (resp. (1.11)).

The ansatz of RSS solutions was originally proposed by Grisha Perelman for backward solutions defined for $-\infty < t < 0$ to Seregin around a decade ago (private communication of G. Seregin). See the Appendix for details. We are not aware of any previous study of RDSS solutions.

Our goal in this paper is to construct RSS/RDSS solutions for general RSS/RDSS initial data. One needs to verify that there is an abundance of nontrivial such $v_0$. If $v_0$ is axisymmetric (i.e., $v_0(x) = R(-s)v_0(R(s)x)$ for any $s$), then RSS is reduced to SS, and RDSS is reduced to DSS. It is relatively easy to construct non-axisymmetric RDSS vector fields, in the same way as the DSS case: One can choose any divergence free vector field with compact support in the annulus $B_\lambda \setminus \bar{B}_1$ (or its intersection with $\mathbb{R}^3_+$), and extend its definition to entire $\mathbb{R}^3$ (or $\mathbb{R}^3_+$) by RDSS property (1.11). To construct non-axisymmetric RSS vector fields, we use the spherical coordinates $\rho, \phi, \theta$ with basis vectors

$$e_\rho = \frac{x}{\rho}, \quad e_\phi = \left(\frac{x_1 x_3}{r\rho}, \frac{x_2 x_3}{r\rho}, -\frac{r}{\rho}\right), \quad e_\theta = \left(-\frac{x_2}{r}, \frac{x_1}{r}, 0\right), \tag{1.13}$$

where $\rho = |x|$ and $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$, and consider vector fields of the form at $\rho = 1$:

$$v_0(1,\phi,\theta) = \frac{f(\phi,\theta)}{\sin\phi} e_\rho + \frac{g(\phi,\theta)}{\sin\phi} e_\phi + h(\phi,\theta) e_\theta. \tag{1.14}$$

The RSS condition (1.10) gives

$$v_0(\rho,\phi,\theta) = \frac{f(\phi,\theta_\rho)}{\rho\sin\phi} e_\rho + \frac{g(\phi,\theta_\rho)}{\rho\sin\phi} e_\phi + \frac{h(\phi,\theta_\rho)}{\rho} e_\theta, \tag{1.15}$$

where $\theta_\rho = \theta - \alpha \ln\rho$. We impose that $f, g, h$ are $2\pi$-periodic in $\theta$ and vanish sufficient order at $\phi = 0, \pi$ or at $\phi = 0, \pi/2$. The divergence-free condition $\operatorname{div} v_0 = 0$ becomes

$$(1 - \alpha\partial_\theta) f + \partial_\phi g + \partial_\theta h = 0. \tag{1.16}$$

To get nontrivial dependence on $\theta$, we may impose the *k-equivariance* ansatz for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$f = \operatorname{Re} F(\phi) e^{ik\theta}, \quad g = \operatorname{Re} G(\phi) e^{ik\theta}, \quad h = \operatorname{Re} H(\phi) e^{ik\theta},$$

and it suffices to choose complex-valued smooth functions $F, G, H$ of $\phi \in (0,\pi)$ (or $\phi \in (0,\pi/2)$) that satisfy

$$(1 - ik\alpha)F + G' + ikH = 0 \tag{1.17}$$

and vanish sufficient order at $\phi = 0, \pi$ (or at $\phi = 0, \pi/2$).

These solutions can be better understood in similarity variables, introduced by Giga-Kohn [7]. Consider the similarity transform

$$v(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} V(z,s), \quad \pi(x,t) = \frac{1}{t}\Pi(z,s), \tag{1.18}$$

where

$$z = \frac{x}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad s = \log t. \tag{1.19}$$

For a cone-like domain $\Omega$, the system of Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) in $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ is equivalent to the time dependent *forward Leray equations*

$$\partial_s V - \frac{1}{2}V - \frac{z}{2} \cdot \nabla_z V - \Delta_z V + V \cdot \nabla_z V + \nabla_z \Pi = 0, \quad \nabla_z \cdot V = 0 \tag{1.20}$$

in $\Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$. When $\partial\Omega$ is nonempty, the boundary condition $v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ corresponds to

$$V|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{1.21}$$

For backward solutions defined for $-\infty < t < 0$, we replace $t$ by $-t$ in (1.18) and (1.19), and get the backward Leray equations

$$\partial_s V + \frac{1}{2}V + \frac{z}{2} \cdot \nabla_z V - \Delta_z V + V \cdot \nabla_z V + \nabla_z \Pi = 0, \quad \nabla_z \cdot V = 0. \tag{1.22}$$

A SS solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1) corresponds to a stationary solution of (1.20) or (1.22). A DSS solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1) with factor $\lambda > 1$ corresponds to an $s$-periodic solution $V(z,s)$ of (1.20) or (1.22) with period $2\log\lambda$. An RSS solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1) satisfying (1.6) with angular speed $\alpha$ corresponds to a solution of (1.20) or (1.22) satisfying (with $\tau = 2\log\lambda$)

$$V(z,s) = R(-\alpha\tau)V(R(\alpha\tau)z, s+\tau), \quad \forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.23}$$

Finally, an RDSS solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1) satisfying (1.9) with factor $\lambda$ and phase $\phi$ corresponds to a solution of (1.20) or (1.22) satisfying

$$V(z,s) = R(-\phi)V(R(\phi)z, s + 2\log\lambda). \tag{1.24}$$

Note we get (1.24) from (1.23) by choosing $\tau = 2\log\lambda$ and $\phi = \alpha\tau$.

The initial condition $v|_{t=0} = v_0$ does not have a clear meaning for $V$ in general, but corresponds to a "boundary condition" for $V(z,s)$ at spatial infinity for SS/DSS/RSS/RDSS solutions, see [15, 4] and §2.

Leray [17] proposed the SS solution as a possible ansatz for singular solutions and gave the stationary case of (1.22). His original problem of existence of $V(z) \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$ was excluded in Nečas, Růžička, and Šverák in [18]. It was later extended to exclude $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $3 < q \le \infty$, or $v \in L^{10/3}(B_1 \times (-1,0))$, by [21]. Giga and Kohn [7] were aware of the correspondence between (1.1) and (1.22) and used the corresponding similarity transform to study the singularity of nonlinear heat equations.

If we assume

$$V(z,s) = R_\theta u(y,s), \quad \Pi(z,s) = p(y,s), \quad y = R_\theta^T z, \tag{1.25}$$

with

$$R_\theta = R(\theta(s))$$

for some function $\theta(s)$, then (1.20) is equivalent to

$$\begin{gathered}\partial_s u + \dot\theta J u - \dot\theta (Jy)\cdot\nabla u - \frac{1}{2}u - \frac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla u - \Delta_y u + u\cdot\nabla u + \nabla p = 0,\\ \nabla\cdot u = 0,\end{gathered} \tag{1.26}$$

where $\nabla = \nabla_y$ and $\Delta = \Delta_y$. If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$, then $v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ implies

$$u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

To illustrate these observations consider the case when $w = V - z = Rq$, $q = u - y$, with $R = R_\theta$. Then

$$(w\cdot\nabla_z V)_i = R_{kl} q_l(y)\partial_{z_k} R_{ij} u_j(R^T z) = R_{kl} q_l(y) R_{ij}\partial_{y_m} u_j(y) R_{km}. \tag{1.27}$$

Since $R\in O(3)$, $R_{kl}R_{km} = \delta_{lm}$ and hence

$$(w\cdot\nabla_z V)_i = \delta_{lm} q_l(y) R_{ij}\partial_{y_m} u_j(y) = R_{ij} q_l(y)\partial_{y_l} u_j(y) = [R(q\cdot\nabla_y u)]_i. \tag{1.28}$$

If $v(x,t)$ is an RSS solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.6), then $V(z,s)$ satisfies (1.23), and hence $u(y,s)$ is a stationary solution of(1.26) with constant $\dot\theta = \alpha$. On the other hand, for any RDSS solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1) satisfying (1.9) with factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi$, $V(z,s)$ satisfies (1.24). Let

$$T = 2\log\lambda, \quad \alpha_k = \frac{2k\pi + \phi}{T}, \tag{1.29}$$

for an arbitrary integer $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. Then $v(x,t)$ corresponds to a periodic solution $u(y,s)$ of (1.26) with constant $\dot\theta = \alpha_k$ and period $T$. To be definite we will take $\alpha = \alpha_0 = \frac{\phi}{T}$.

To construct solutions in Theorem 1.3 using our method, the system (1.26) needs not be autonomous but needs to be periodic in $s$. However, we have not been able to find applications of non-constant $\dot\theta$, hence we will let $\dot\theta = \alpha$ be constant in the rest of the paper for simplicity of presentation.

The natural spaces to study $v_0$ and $v$ as described above are, respectively, $L^3_w(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $L^\infty((0,\infty); L^3_w(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Recall that $f\in L^3_w(\Omega)$ if and only if $\|f\|_{L^3_w(\Omega)} < \infty$, where

$$\|f\|_{L^3_w(\Omega)} = \sup_{s>0} s\, m(f,s)^{1/3}, \tag{1.30}$$

and $m(f,s)$ is the distribution function of $f$ given by

$$m(f,s) = |\{x\in\Omega : |f(x)| > s\}|.$$

Let $L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ be the subspace of $L^3_w(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^3)$ of divergence free vector fields which satisfy $v_0\cdot\nu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ if $\partial\Omega$ is nonempty and has the unit outer normal vector field $\nu$.

Since $L^3_w(\mathbb{R}^3)$ embeds continuously into the space of uniformly locally square integrable functions $L^2_{u\,loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, one may construct global-in-time *local Leray solutions* for our data as in [10, 22, 4] in the whole space. However, because this paper aims to construct solutions on both the whole and half spaces, and there is presently no existence theory for local Leray solutions on the half space, we only construct weak solutions.

**Definition 1.1** (EP-solutions to (1.1)). *Let $\Omega$ be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The vector field $v$ defined on $\Omega \times (0,\infty)$ is an* energy perturbed solution to (1.1) *– i.e. an* EP-solution *– with initial data $v_0 \in L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ if*

$$\int_0^\infty \big((v, \partial_s f) - (\nabla v, \nabla f) - v \cdot \nabla v, f)\big)\, ds = 0, \tag{1.31}$$

*for all $f \in \{f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+) : \nabla \cdot f = 0\}$, if*

$$v - Sv_0 \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega)),$$

*for any $T > 0$, and if*

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \|v(t) - Sv_0(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0,$$

*where $Sv_0(t) \in L^\infty(0,\infty; L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega))$ is the solution to the time-dependent Stokes system with initial data $v_0$, see §3.*

*Remark* 1.2. The name "energy perturbed solution" means that the difference $v - Sv_0$ is in the energy class, although $Sv_0$ is not. We do not mention the pressure in Definition 2.2. Note that a pressure can be constructed after the fact since $Sv_0$ has an associated pressure and $v - Sv_0 \in L^2$ for all positive times.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Assume $v_0$ is in $L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ where $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$.*

*(i) (RSS) If $v_0$ is RSS, satisfying (1.10) for some angular speed $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists an EP-solution $v$ on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ with initial data $v_0$, which is RSS and satisfies (1.6) for the same $\alpha$. It satisfies $v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$.*

*(ii) (RDSS) If $v_0$ is RDSS, satisfying (1.11) for some factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists an EP-solution $v$ on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ with initial data $v_0$, which is RDSS and satisfies (1.9) for the same $\lambda$ and $\phi$. It satisfies $v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$.*

*Comments on Theorem 1.3*

- If $\alpha = 0$ then the class of RDSS solutions coincides with the class of $\lambda$-DSS solutions defined in [22, 4] (where they were only considered on the whole space). Theorem 1.3 therefore provides a construction of $\lambda$-DSS solutions on the half-space for any divergence free $\lambda$-DSS initial data belonging to $L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$.
- If $v_0$ is RSS then it is RDSS for any $\lambda > 1$ and thus there exist EP-solutions $v_\lambda$ to the 3D NSE on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ which are RDSS. Letting $\lambda \to 1$ we can obtain a solution $v$ which is RSS. This procedure mimics that given in [4, Section 5.1] and we omit the details.

In our proof we directly construct a solution to the rotated Leray equations (1.26). To do this we perturb $u(y,s)$ by subtracting the image $U_0(y,s)$ of the solution to the Stokes equations under the rotated self-similar transform, i.e. we seek a solution of the form $U = u - U_0$. Essentially, we are treating $U_0$ as the boundary data at spatial infinity of $u$. Fortunately, $U \in L^2$ (which is untrue for both $u$ and $U_0$). To get formal a priori estimates for $U$ via energy methods we develop new bounds for $U_0$ using

self-similarity and Solonnikov's formulas in $\mathbb{R}^3_+$ [20] (in [4] we were working with the solution to the heat equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which was easier to bound). Unfortunately, $U_0$ does not give us the needed a priori bound since we don't have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (U \cdot \nabla U_0) \cdot U \, dy \leq \gamma \|U\|^2_{H^1},$$

where $0 < \gamma < 1$. The idea is to replace $U_0$ by an asymptotically similar profile $W$ which allows the above estimate. In the whole space case [4], we used a non-compact correction involving singular integrals to ensure $W$ was divergence free. This does not work when there are boundaries. To get around this we construct another profile $W$ using the Bogovskii map [3].

On the other hand, since we do not seek local Leray solutions our argument is shorter than in [4]. In particular, we do not need to use mollifiers to obtain the local energy inequality when we are constructing $U$ via a Galerkin scheme. We also do not need a priori bounds for the pressure; these were only used in [4] to obtain the local energy inequality.

*Remark* 1.4. Note that, in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ case, we can recover pressure estimate and local energy inequality in Theorem 1.3, in the same way as in [4].

*Notation.* We will use the following function spaces on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &= \{f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3),\ \nabla \cdot f = 0\}, \\ X &= \text{the closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega), \\ H &= \text{the closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

where $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in the Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$. Let $X^*(\Omega)$ denote the dual space of $X(\Omega)$. Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the dual product for $H^1$ and its dual space $H^{-1}$, or that for $X$ and $X^*$.

*Organization.* In Section 2 we construct solutions to a rotationally corrected Leray system. In Section 3 we study RDSS solutions to the Stokes equations. Section 4 contains the proof of Theorem 1.3 which uses the results of Sections 2 and 3. Finally, in Section 5 the Appendix, we give comments on the backward case.

# 2 An auxiliary problem in similarity variables

In this section we study a time periodic weak solution to the auxiliary problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_s u + \alpha J u - \alpha J y \cdot \nabla u - \Delta u = \tfrac{1}{2} u + \tfrac{1}{2} y \cdot \nabla u - \nabla p - u \cdot \nabla u && \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \\ &\nabla \cdot u = 0 && \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \\ &u = 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \\ &\lim_{|y_0| \to \infty} \int_{B_1(y_0) \cap \Omega} |u(y,s) - U_0(y,s)|^2 \, dx = 0 && \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R} \\ &u(\cdot, s) = u(\cdot, s+T) && \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$ and $U_0(y,s)$ is a given $T$-periodic divergence free vector field defined on $\Omega$ which vanishes on $\partial\Omega$. If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ we ignore the boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$. Our goal is to construct a solution $u$ satisfying the problem in the weak sense, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big((u, \partial_s f) - (\nabla u, \nabla f) + (\alpha J y \cdot \nabla u - \alpha J u + \frac{1}{2}u + \frac{1}{2} y \cdot \nabla u - u \cdot \nabla u, f)\big)\, ds = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

holds for all divergence free $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$.

In our application we require that $U_0$ additionally satisfies the following assumption.

**Assumption 2.1.** *The vector field $U_0(y,s) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is periodic in $s$ with period $T > 0$, divergence free, vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, and satisfies, for some $q \in (3, \infty]$,*

- *for all divergence free $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big((U_0, \partial_s f) - (\nabla U_0, \nabla f) + (\alpha J y \cdot \nabla U_0 - \alpha J U_0 + \frac{U_0}{2} + \frac{y}{2} \cdot \nabla U_0, f)\big)\, ds = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

- *the inclusions:*

$$U_0 \in L^\infty(0,T; L^4 \cap L^q(\Omega)),$$
$$\partial_s U_0 \in L^\infty(0,T; L^{6/5}_{loc}(\overline{\Omega})), \quad \nabla U_0 \in L^2(0,T; L^2_{loc}(\overline{\Omega})),$$

- *the decay estimate:*

$$\sup_{s \in [0,T]} \|U_0\|_{L^q(\Omega \setminus B_R)} \le \Theta(R), \quad (2.4)$$

*for some $\Theta : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\Theta(R) \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$.*

The decay estimate (2.4) ensures the existence of a good revised asymptotic profile in Lemma 2.5. The assumption $U_0 \in L^\infty(0,T; L^4(\Omega))$ implies in particular $U_0 \cdot \nabla U_0 \in L^2(0,T; H^{-1}(\Omega))$, which is essential for the a priori bound in Lemma 2.6.

Periodic weak solutions to (2.1) are defined as follows.

**Definition 2.2** (Periodic weak solutions to (2.1))**.** *Let $U_0$ satisfy Assumption 2.1. The field $u$ is a periodic weak solution to (2.1) if it is divergence free, if $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, if $u(s) = u(s+T)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, if*

$$U := u - U_0 \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega)),$$

*and if $u$ satisfies (2.2) for all divergence free $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$.*

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.3** (Existence of periodic weak solutions to (2.1))**.** *Let $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$ and assume $U_0 : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $q = 10/3$. Then, there exists a periodic weak solution to (2.1) corresponding to $U_0$ in the sense of Definition 2.2.*

The choice $q = 10/3$ was chosen for Remark 1.4, for the convenience of the proof of the local energy inequality, see [4]. Otherwise we can take any $q \in (3, \infty]$.

To prove Theorem 1.3 we seek a solution of the form $u = U + U_0$ as this homogenizes the boundary condition at spatial infinity. This leads to a source term in the perturbed equation that is not necessarily small. To get around this we replace $U_0$ by $W$ which eliminates the possibly large behavior of $U_0$ near the origin, with the correction $W - U_0$ being compactly supported. This will give us the crucial bound,

$$\int (f \cdot \nabla f) \cdot W \, dy \leq \delta ||f||^2_{H^1_0(\Omega)}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\delta$ is a given small parameter.

Fix $Z \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq Z \leq 1$, $Z(y) = 1$ for $|y| > 1$, and $Z(y) = 0$ for $|y| < 1/2$. This can be done so that $|\nabla Z| + |\nabla^2 Z| \lesssim 1$. Fix $r > 1$ and let $U_r(y) = U_0(ry)$. Let $\hat{U}_r(y) = Z(y)U_r(y)$. Then,

$$\nabla \cdot \hat{U}_r = U_r \cdot \nabla Z.$$

Since this is non-zero we will need a correction term obtained by Bogovskii's construction from [3] which we now recall.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let $K$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. There is a linear map $\Phi$ such that for any scalar $f \in C^\infty_0(K)$ with $\int_K f \, dx = 0$, we have $\Phi f \in C^\infty_0(K)$,*

$$\nabla \cdot \Phi f = f,$$

*and,*

$$\|\Phi f\|_{W^{1,q}(K)} \leq c(q, K) \|f\|_{L^q(K)},$$

*for any $1 < q < \infty$. Thus $\Phi$ can be extended to a bounded map from $\{f \in L^q(K) : \int_K f \, dx = 0\}$ to $W^{1,q}_0(K)$.*

Let $K = B_1 \cap \Omega$. Since $U_0$ is divergence free we have,

$$\int U_r \cdot \nabla Z \, dx = 0,$$

and can thus apply Lemma 2.4 and let $w_r := \Phi(U_r \cdot \nabla Z)$. Then,

$$\nabla \cdot w_r = -U_r \cdot \nabla Z,$$

and, furthermore,

$$\|w_r\|_{W^{1,q}(B_1)} \leq c(q, B_1) \|U_r \cdot \nabla Z\|_{L^q} \leq c(q, B_1, Z) \|U_r\|_{L^q}. \tag{2.6}$$

Let $\hat{U}_0(ry) = \hat{U}_r(y)$ and $w(ry) = w_r(y)$. Our replacement for $U_0$ is,

$$W := \hat{U}_0 + w, \quad W(y) = U_0(y)Z(y/r) + w_r(y/r).$$

The following notation is convenient. For a given $F(y, s)$ and any $\zeta \in C^1_0(\Omega)$, denote

$$LF = \partial_s F + \alpha JF - \alpha Jy \cdot \nabla F - \Delta F - \frac{1}{2}F - \frac{1}{2} y \cdot \nabla F,$$

and

$$\langle LF, \zeta \rangle = (\partial_s F + \alpha JF - \alpha Jy \cdot \nabla F - \frac{1}{2}F - \frac{1}{2} y \cdot \nabla F, \zeta) + (\nabla F, \nabla \zeta). \tag{2.7}$$

**Lemma 2.5** (Revised asymptotic profile). *Let $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. Fix $q \in (3, \infty]$ and suppose $U_0$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 for this $q$. For any small $\delta > 0$, let $W$, $\hat{U}_0$, and $w$ be defined as above with $r = r_0(\delta)$ sufficiently large. Then $W$ is $T$-periodic and divergence free,*

$$U_0 - W \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\|W\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \le \delta, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\|W\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\Omega))} \le c(r_0, U_0), \tag{2.10}$$

*and*

$$\|LW\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^{-1}(\Omega))} \le c(r_0, U_0), \tag{2.11}$$

*where $c(r_0, U_0)$ depends on $r_0$ and quantities associated with $U_0$ which are finite by Assumption 2.1.*

*Proof.* $T$-periodicity in $s$ follows from the fact that $U_0$ is $T$-periodic. $W$ is divergence free since $\nabla \cdot w_r = -U_r \cdot \nabla Z$.

To see (2.8), recall that $U_0 - W = (U_0 - \hat{U}_0) - w$. Both $U_0 - \hat{U}_0$ and $w$ are supported in $K$. Since $w \in W^{1,q}_0(K)$ by (2.6), we have $w \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. The difference $U_0 - \hat{U}_0$ is in $L^\infty L^2 \cap L^2 H^1$ by Assumption 2.1. Therefore, we have (2.8).

We now get refined estimates for $w$ in $W^{1,q}$ using (2.6): For any $r > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r} |w(y)|^q \, dx &= \int_{B_1} |w(rz)|^q r^3 \, dz \\
&= r^3 \int_{B_1} |w_r(z)|^q \, dz \\
&\le c(q, B_1, Z) r^3 \int_{B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}} |U_0(zr)|^q \, dz \\
&= c(q, B_1, Z) \int_{B_r \setminus B_{r/2}} |U_0(y)|^q \, dy,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r} |\nabla w(y)|^q \, dy &= \int_{B_1} |r^{-1} \nabla_z w(rz)|^q r^3 \, dz \\
&= r^{3-q} \int_{B_1} |\nabla_z w_r(z)|^q \, dz \\
&\le c(q, B_1, Z) r^{3-q} \int_{B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}} |U_0(zr)|^q \, dz \\
&= c(q, B_1, Z) r^{-q} \int_{B_r \setminus B_{r/2}} |U_0(y)|^q \, dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Note that the constants above do not depend on $r$.

Since $W = \hat{U}_0 + w$, by (2.12) and the definition of $\Theta(r)$,

$$\|W\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \le \Theta(r_0/2) + c(q, B_1, Z)^{1/q} \Theta(r_0/2) \le \delta,$$

for $r_0$ sufficiently large. This show (2.9).

To prove (2.10), we first establish a pointwise estimate for $w$,

$$|w(y)| \lesssim r^{1-3/q}\|\nabla w\|_{L^q(B_r)} + r^{-3/q}\|w\|_{L^q(B_r)}.$$

Since $w$ is compactly supported this implies that $w \in L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\Omega))$. By assumption 2.1, $U_0 \in L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\Omega))$. Therefore, $W \in L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\Omega))$ also.

We now prove (2.11). First observe that, since $\partial_s w_r = \Phi(\partial_s U_r \cdot \nabla Z)$, by (2.13) we have

$$\|\partial_s w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla \partial_s w\|_{L^{6/5}(\Omega)} \lesssim r^{-1}\|\partial_s U_0\|_{L^{6/5}(B_r)},$$

which is finite by Assumption 2.1. Since $w$ is compactly supported, the $W^{1,q}$ estimates imply $w \in H^1$. It follows that $\|\alpha Jw - \alpha Jy\cdot\nabla W - \Delta w - w - y\cdot\nabla w\|_{H^{-1}} < \infty$. Hence $Lw \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{-1})$. Let $Z_*(y) = Z(-y/r_0)$ so that $\hat{U}_0(y) = U_0(y)Z_*(y)$. Then,

$$LW = (LU_0)Z_* + Lw - \alpha Jy\cdot\nabla Z_* U_0 - 2\nabla Z_*\cdot\nabla U_0 - U_0\Delta Z_* - y\cdot\nabla Z_* U_0.$$

By Assumption 2.1, $LU_0 = 0$. Since $Z_*$ is compactly supported, Assumption 2.1 implies that $\alpha Jy\cdot\nabla Z_* U_0 - 2\nabla Z_*\cdot\nabla U_0 - U_0\Delta Z_* - y\cdot\nabla Z_* U_0 \in L^2$. Hence $LW \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{-1})$. □

We seek a solution to (2.1) of the form $u = W + U$, where $W$ is as in Lemma 2.5 for $\delta = 1/4$ for a given $U_0$ satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let

$$\mathcal{R}(W) := LW + W\cdot\nabla W, \tag{2.14}$$

where $L$ is defined by (2.7). The weak formulation for $U$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}(U,f) = &-(\nabla U,\nabla f) + (-\alpha JU + \alpha Jy\cdot\nabla U + \frac{1}{2}U + \frac{1}{2}y\cdot\nabla U, f)\\ &- (U\cdot\nabla U, f) - (W\cdot\nabla U + U\cdot\nabla W, f) - \langle\mathcal{R}(W), f\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

and holds for all $f \in \mathcal{V}$ and a.e. $s \in (0,T)$.

We use the Galerkin method as in [4]. Let $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ be an orthonormal basis of $H$. For a fixed $k$, we look for an approximation solution of the form $U_k(y,s) = \sum_{i=1}^k b_{ki}(s)a_i(y)$. We first prove the existence of and *a priori* bounds for $T$-periodic solutions $b_k = (b_{k1},\dots,b_{kk})$ to the system of ODEs

$$\frac{d}{ds}b_{kj} = \sum_{i=1}^k A_{ij}b_{ki} + \sum_{i,l=1}^k B_{ilj}b_{ki}b_{kl} + C_j, \tag{2.16}$$

for $j \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}A_{ij} &= -(\nabla a_i,\nabla a_j) + (-\alpha Ja_i + \alpha Jy\cdot\nabla a_i + \frac{1}{2}a_i + \frac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla a_i, a_j)\\ &\quad - (a_i\cdot\nabla W, a_j) - (W\cdot\nabla a_i, a_j)\\ B_{ilj} &= -(a_i\cdot\nabla a_l, a_j)\\ C_j &= -\langle\mathcal{R}(W), a_j\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.6** (Construction of Galerkin approximations). *Fix $T > 0$ and let $W$ satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 2.5 with $\delta = \frac{1}{4}$.*

1. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the system of ODEs (2.16) has a $T$-periodic solution $b_k \in H^1(0,T)$.*

2. *Letting*
$$U_k(y,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_{ki}(s) a_i(y),$$
*we have*
$$||U_k||_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + ||U_k||_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} < C, \tag{2.17}$$
*where $C$ is independent of $k$.*

*Proof.* Our proof is nearly identical to [4, Proof of Lemma 2.6]. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $U^0 \in \operatorname{span}(a_1, \dots, a_k)$, there exist $b_{kj}(s)$ uniquely solving (2.16) with initial value $b_{kj}(0) = (U^0, a_j)$, and belonging to $H^1(0,\tilde{T})$ for some time $0 < \tilde{T} \le T$. Based on [4, Proof of Lemma 2.6] we may assume $\tilde{T} = T$. Multiply the $j$-th equation of (2.16) by $b_{kj}$ and sum to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}||U_k||_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}||U_k||_{L^2}^2 + ||\nabla U_k||_{L^2}^2 \\ &\le -(U_k \cdot \nabla W, U_k) - \langle \mathcal{R}(W), U_k \rangle - (\alpha J U_k - \alpha J y \cdot \nabla U_k, U_k). \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

We now bound the right hand side of the above inequality. From the definition of $J$ we have
$$(\alpha J U_k - \alpha J y \cdot \nabla U_k, U_k) = 0.$$
By (2.9) and $\operatorname{div} U_k = 0$, we have
$$\left|(U_k \cdot \nabla W, U_k)\right| \le \frac{1}{8}||U_k||_{H^1}^2. \tag{2.19}$$
Recall that $\mathcal{R}(W) = LW + \operatorname{div}(W \otimes W)$. Then,
$$|(\mathcal{R}(W), U_k)| \le (\|LW\|_{H^{-1}} + \|W\|_{L^4}^2)\|U_k\|_{H^1} \le C_2 + \frac{1}{8}||U_k||_{H^1}^2. \tag{2.20}$$
where $C_2 = C(\|LW\|_{H^{-1}} + \|W\|_{L^4}^2)^2$ is independent of $s$, $T$, and $k$.

Using Lemma 2.5, the estimates (2.18)–(2.20) imply
$$\frac{d}{ds}||U_k||_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}||U_k||_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}||\nabla U_k||_{L^2}^2 \le C_2. \tag{2.21}$$
The Gronwall inequality implies
$$\begin{aligned} e^{s/2}||U_k(s)||_{L^2}^2 &\le ||U^0||_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T e^{\tau/2} C_2 \, dt \\ &\le ||U^0||_{L^2}^2 + e^{T/2} C_2 T \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

for all $s \in [0,T]$.

By (2.22) we can choose $\rho > 0$ (independent of $k$) so that

$$||U^0||_{L^2} \leq \rho \Rightarrow ||U_k(T)||_{L^2} \leq \rho.$$

The mapping $\mathcal{T} : B_\rho^k \to B_\rho^k$ given by $\mathcal{T}(b_k(0)) = b_k(T)$, where $B_\rho^k$ is the closed ball of radius $\rho$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, is continuous. Thus $\mathcal{T}$ has a fixed point by the Brouwer fixed-point theorem, i.e. there exists some $U^0 \in \text{span}(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ so that $b_k(0) = b_k(T)$.

It remains to check that (2.17) holds. The $L^\infty L^2$ bound follows from (2.22) since $\|U^0\|_{L^2} \leq \rho$, which is independent of $k$. Integrating (2.21) over $[0,T]$ and using $U_k(0) = U_k(T)$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \left(||U_k||_{L^2}^2 + ||\nabla U_k||_{L^2}^2\right) dt \leq C_2 T \tag{2.23}$$

which gives an upper bound for $\|U_k\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}$ which is uniform in $k$. □

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* By standard arguments, there exists $U \in L^2(0,T;H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and a subsequence of $\{U_k\}$ (which we still index with $k$) so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_k \to U \text{ weakly in } L^2(0,T;X),\\
&U_k \to U \text{ strongly in } L^2(0,T;L^2(K)) \text{ for all compact sets } K \subset \bar{\Omega},\\
&U_k(s) \to U(s) \text{ weakly in } L^2 \text{ for all } s \in [0,T].
\end{aligned}$$

The weak convergence guarantees that $U(0) = U(T)$, and that $U$ satisfies (2.15).

Let $u = U + W$. Since $W$ and $U$ are $T$-periodic, so is $u$. That $u$ satisfies (2.2) follows from (2.15) and integrating in time. The *a priori* bounds for $u - W$ extend to bounds for $u - U_0$ since $U_0 - W \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. This implies that $u$ is a periodic weak solution in the sense of Definition 2.2. □

# 3 The non-stationary Stokes system

In this section we study the non-stationary Stokes system in $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. The result will be used to verify Assumption 2.1 for suitable initial data and $U_0$ defined by (4.1) in §4. The focus is on the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$ since the Stokes system is reduced to the heat equation when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$.

The non-stationary Stokes system is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t v - \Delta v + \nabla \pi = 0 \quad &&\text{in } \Omega \times [0,\infty)\\
&\nabla \cdot v = 0 &&\text{in } \Omega \times [0,\infty),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

and is required to satisfy the initial condition

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0,$$

where $v_0 \in L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ is given. If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$ then we augment (3.1) with the boundary condition

$$v|_{x_3=0} = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Let $S$ denote the solution operator for the Stokes system (3.1)–(3.2) on $\Omega$. If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ then $S$ is just the solution operator for the heat equation, i.e.,

$$Sv_0(x,t) = e^{t\Delta}v_0(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} T(x,y,t)v_0(y)\,dy,$$

where

$$T(x,y,t) = \frac{C}{t^{3/2}}\,e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}}, \quad C = (4\pi)^{-3/2}.$$

If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$ the formula for $S$ is more complicated. In [20], Solonnikov showed that if $v_0$ is divergence free and vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, then

$$(Sv_0)_i(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G_{i,j}(x,y,t)v_{0j}(y)\,dy,$$

for

$$G_{i,j}(x,y,t) = \delta_{i,j}T(x,y,t) + G^*_{i,j}(x,y,t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G^*_{i,j}(x,y,t) = &-\delta_{i,j}T(x,y^*,t) \\ &- 4(1-\delta_{j,3})\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[0,x_3]}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}E(x-z)T(z,y^*,t)\,dz, \end{aligned}$$

and $E(x) = (4\pi|x|)^{-1}$ is the fundamental solution to the Laplace equation on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and for a given $y = (y_1,y_2,y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we denote

$$y' = (y_1,y_2), \quad y^* = (y_1,y_2,-y_3).$$

Moreover, $G^*_{ij}$ satisfies the pointwise bound ([20, (2.38)]

$$|\partial_t^s D_x^m D_y^\ell G^*_{ij}(x,y,t)| \lesssim t^{-s-\ell_3/2}(\sqrt{t}+x_3)^{-m_3}(\sqrt{t}+|x-y^*|)^{-3-|m'|-|\ell'|}e^{-\frac{cy_3^2}{t}} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \{0,1,2,\ldots\}$ and $m,\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$. Note that the $L^p \to L^q$ bound of $S(t)$ in [23] is not sufficient for our purpose.

We first observe that, when $v_0$ is RDSS for given factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., $v_0$ satisfies (1.11)), $Sv_0$ is RDSS for the same values of $\lambda$ and $\phi$, (i.e., $Sv_0$ satisfies (1.9)). To see this in the whole space case let $\xi = \lambda R(\phi)y$. We have $|x-y|^2/(4t) = |\lambda R(\phi)x - \xi|^2/(4\lambda^2 t)$ and $d\xi = \lambda^3 dy$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Sv_0(x,t) &= \lambda R(-\phi)\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{C}{(\lambda^2 t)^{3/2}}e^{|\lambda R(\phi)x-\xi|^2/(4\lambda^2 t)}v_0(\xi)\,d\xi \\ &= \lambda R(-\phi)Sv_0(R(\phi)\lambda x, \lambda^2 t). \end{aligned}$$

For the half space case note that the above scaling goes through if $T(x,y,t)$ is replaced by $T(x,y^*,t)$. For the remaining part of $G^*_{i,j}$ we carry out a change of variables letting

$\chi = \lambda R(\phi)x$, $\xi = \lambda R(\phi)y$, and $\zeta = \lambda R(\phi)z$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[0,x_3]} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} E(x-z)T(z,y^*,t)\,dz\,v_{0j}(y)\,dy \\
&= C\lambda R(-\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[0,x_3]} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{1}{|x-z|} \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 t)^{3/2}} e^{-|z-y^*|^2/4t} v_{0j}(\xi)\,dz\,d\xi \\
&= C\lambda R(-\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[0,\chi_3]} \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_i} \frac{1}{|\chi-\xi|} \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 t)^{3/2}} e^{-|\zeta-\xi^*|^2/4\lambda^2 t} v_{0j}(\xi)\,d\zeta\,d\chi.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $Sv_0$ also satisfies the desired scaling (1.9) when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$.

If $v_0$ is RSS with angular speed $\alpha$ (i.e., $v_0$ satisfies (1.10)), then it satisfies (1.11) for any $\lambda > 1$ with $\phi = 2\alpha \log \lambda$. By the above, $Sv_0$ is also RDSS with the same $\lambda$ and $\phi$. Thus $Sv_0$ is RSS and satisfies (1.6) with the same $\alpha$.

In [4, Lemma 3.1], functions in $L^3_w(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap$DSS are shown to belong to $L^3_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\})$. The next lemma extends this to RDSS functions on the whole or half space.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Assume $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. If $f$ is defined in $\Omega$ and is RDSS with factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$, then $f \in L^3_{loc}(\Omega \setminus \{0\})$ if and only if $f \in L^3_w(\Omega)$.*

*Proof.* Recall the distribution function for $f$ is

$$m(\sigma, f) = |\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \sigma\}|,$$

and the well known identity

$$\int_\Omega |f|^p\,dx = p\int_0^\infty \sigma^p m(\sigma, f)d\sigma/\sigma,$$

which holds for $1 \le p < \infty$. Let $A_r = \{x \in \Omega : r \le |x| < r\lambda\}$, and decompose $f$ as $f = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} f_k$ where $f_k(x) = f(x)$ if $x \in A_{\lambda^k}$ and $f_k(x) = 0$ otherwise. For $\beta > 0$,

$$m(\beta, f) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} m(\beta, f_k) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} m(\lambda^k\beta, f_0)\lambda^{3k}, \tag{3.4}$$

where we have used the scaling property

$$f_k(x) = \lambda^{-k} R(k\phi) f_0(\lambda^{-k} R(-k\phi)x), \tag{3.5}$$

since $f$ is RDSS. This says rotational corrections do not effect the scaling of the distribution functions $m$ when compared to the DSS case considered in [4, Lemma 3.1]. Indeed, (3.4) matches [4, Equation (3.2)] and the ensuing steps from [4, Proof of Lemma 3.1] apply. We thus omit the remaining details. □

The next several lemmas concern the integrability and decay of solutions to the Stokes system where the initial data is RDSS and belongs to $L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. Suppose $v_0 \in L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ is RDSS with factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$, and for all $R > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{t\geq 1} \|\partial_t^s \nabla_x^m S v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\cap B_R)} < \infty. \tag{3.6}$$

*Proof.* This is trivial in the whole space – see [4]. Assume $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$.

Let $A_{\lambda^k} = \{x \in \Omega : \lambda^k \leq |x| < \lambda^{k+1}\}$. Assume $x \in B_R$ for some $R > 1$. Choose $k_0$ sufficiently large so that $2R < \lambda^{k_0}$. Recall that

$$(Sv_0)_i(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} G_{i,j}(x,y,t) v_{0j}(y)\, dy,$$

where $G_{i,j} = -\delta_{i,j} T(x,z,t) + G^*_{i,j}$. By the Solonnikov estimate (3.3), we have

$$\sup_{t>1} \left|\partial_t^s \nabla_x^m G_{i,j}(x,y,t)\right| \leq \frac{C_{s,m}}{(1+|x-y|)^3}. \tag{3.7}$$

Denote $g(y) = \partial_t^s \nabla_x^m G_{i,j}(x,y,t)$. For $k \geq k_0$ and $y \in A^{\lambda^k}$, we have $\left|g(y)\right| \lesssim |y|^{-3}$ and

$$\int_{A^{\lambda^k}} |g(y)|^{3/2}\, dy \lesssim \lambda^{-3k/2}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} g(y) v_{0j}(y)\, dy\right| &\leq \|g\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{k_0}})} \|v_0\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{k_0}})} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k\geq k_0} \|g\|_{L^{3/2}(A_{\lambda^k})} \|v_0\|_{L^3(A_{\lambda^k})} \\ &\leq \|g\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{k_0}})} \|v_0\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{k_0}})} + C\|v_0\|_{L^3(A_1)} \sum_{k\geq k_0} \lambda^{-k},\end{aligned}$$

which is finite by Lemma 3.1 because $v_0 \in L^3_w$. The above shows (3.6). ∎

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. Suppose $v_0 \in L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ is RDSS with factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,*

$$\sup_{1\leq t\leq \lambda^2} \|Sv_0(t)\|_{L^q(|x|>r)} \leq \Theta(r),$$

*for any $q \in (3,\infty]$ and $t \in [1,\lambda^2]$ where $\Theta : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ depends on $q$ but satisfies $\Theta(r) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$.*

*Proof.* If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ then the proof of [4, Lemma 3.2] applies here with only superficial changes and we omit the details. We thus focus on the half space case.

Assume $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$ and $v_0$ is as in the statement of the lemma. By Lemma 3.1 we have $v_0 \in L^3_{loc}(\Omega \setminus \{0\})$. Let

$$\omega_1(l) = \sup_{1<|x_0|<\lambda} \left(\int_{B(x_0,l)\cap\Omega} |v_0(x)|^3\, dx\right)^{1/3},$$

and

$$\omega_2(l) = \left( \int_{x\in\Omega; x_3<l; 1\le|x|\le\lambda} |v_0(x)|^3\,dx \right)^{1/3}.$$

Clearly $\omega_1(l), \omega_2(l) \to 0$ as $l \to 0$.

Let $A_r = \{x \in \Omega : r \le |x| < \lambda r\}$ and $A_r^* = \{z : r/2 \le |z| < 2\lambda r\}$. We first estimate $\|Sv_0(t)\|_{L^q(A_r)}$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
&(Sv_0)_i(x,t)\\
&= \left\{ \int_{|y|<r/2} + \int_{y\in A_r^*; |x-y|<\gamma r} + \int_{y\in A_r^*; |x-y|\ge\gamma r} + \int_{2\lambda r\le|y|} \right\} \delta_{i,j} T(x,y,t) v_{0j}(y)\,dy\\
&+ \left\{ \int_{|y|<r/2} + \int_{y\in A_r^*; y_3<\gamma r} + \int_{y\in A_r^*; y_3\ge\gamma r} + \int_{2\lambda r\le|y|} \right\} G_{i,j}^*(x,y,t) v_{0j}(y)\,dy \qquad (3.8)\\
&= I_0^r(x,t) + I_1^r(x,t) + I_2^r(x,t) + I_3^r(x,t)\\
&+ J_0^r(x,t) + J_1^r(x,t) + J_2^r(x,t) + J_3^r(x,t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \gamma \ll 1$ is an as-of-yet unspecified parameter. We suppress the indexes $i$ and $j$ since they play no role in our estimates.

Fix $r > 1$ and $(x,t) \in A_r \times [1, \lambda^2]$. Using the formula for $T$ it is easy to see that

$$|I_0^r(x,t)| + |I_3^r(x,t)| \lesssim e^{-cr^2}.$$

We have by Hölder's inequality that

$$|I_1^r(x,t)| \le C \|e^{-cx^2}\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|v_0\|_{L^3(B(x,\gamma r))}.$$

By re-scaling $v_0$ we have

$$\|v_0\|_{L^3(B(x,\gamma r))} \le \omega_1(\gamma),$$

and, therefore,

$$|I_1^r(x,t)| \le C\omega_1(\gamma).$$

Also, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2^r(x,t)| &\le C \int_{A_r^*} e^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} |v_0(z)|\,dz\\
&\le C e^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} \|v_0\|_{L^3(A_r^*)} \|1\|_{L^{3/2}(A_r^*)} \le C e^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} r^2.
\end{aligned} \qquad (3.9)$$

The remaining integrals will be bounded using Solonnikov estimate (3.3) with $s = |m| = |\ell| = 0$,

$$\sup_{t\ge1} |G_{ij}^*(x,y,t)| \lesssim \frac{e^{-cy_3^2}}{(1 + x_3 + y_3 + |x' - y'|)^3}. \qquad (3.10)$$

We first bound $J_0^r(x)$. Since $|y| < r/2$ and $|x| \ge r$, we have

$$x_3 + y_3 + |x' - y'| \gtrsim r. \qquad (3.11)$$

Thus $|G^*_{i,j}(x,y,t)| \lesssim r^{-3}$ in the integrand of $J^r_0$. It follows that

$$|J^r_0(x)| \leq \frac{C}{r^3}\int_{B_{r/2}(0)} |v_0(y)|\,dy = \frac{C}{r^3}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|v_0\|_{L^1(A_{r/(2\lambda^k)})}.$$

Note that

$$\|v_0\|_{L^1(A_{r/(2\lambda^k)})} \leq Cr^2\|v_0\|_{L^3(A_{r/(2\lambda^k)})} = Cr^2,$$

independent of $k$, using the fact that $v_0$ is RDSS. Thus

$$|J^r_0(x)| \lesssim r^{-1}.$$

Similarly, for $J^r_3(x)$, since $|y| > 2\lambda r$ and $|x| \leq \lambda r$, we also have (3.11). Thus $|G^*_{i,j}(x,y,t)| \lesssim r^{-3}$ in the integrand of $J^r_3$, and

$$|J^r_3(x)| \leq \frac{C}{r^3}\int_{B^C_{2\lambda r}(0)} |v_0(y)|\,dy = \frac{C}{r^3}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|v_0\|_{L^1(A_{2\lambda^k r})} \lesssim r^{-1}.$$

To bound $J^r_1$ note that

$$\frac{e^{-cy_3^2}}{(1+x_3+|x'-y'|)^3} \leq \frac{e^{-cy_3^2}}{(1+|x'-y'|)^3} \in L^{3/2}(\Omega),$$

uniformly in $x \in A_r$. Then, by (3.10) and Hölder's inequality,

$$|J^r_1(x)| \leq \left\| \frac{e^{-cy_3^2}}{(1+x_3+|x'-y'|)^3} \right\|_{L^{3/2}} \int_{y\in A^*_r; y_3<\gamma r} |v_0|^3\,dy \lesssim \omega_2(\gamma),$$

where we have re-scaled $v_0$ to obtain the last inequality.

For $J^r_2$ we have by Hölder's inequality, the fact that $y_3 \geq \gamma r$, and re-scaling that

$$|J^r_2(x)| \lesssim e^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} r^2 \|v_0\|_{L^3(A^*_1)}.$$

Taken together, these estimates show that for $r > 1$

$$\|Sv_0(t)\|_{L^\infty(A_r)} \leq C\omega_1(\gamma) + C\omega_2(\gamma) + Ce^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} r^2 + Ce^{-cr^2} + Cr^{-1}, \tag{3.12}$$

where the constants are independent of $r$ and $\gamma$. The above inequality is still valid if $\lambda^k r$ replaces $r$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, indeed we have

$$\|Sv_0\|_{L^\infty(A_{\lambda^k r})} \leq C\omega_1(\gamma) + C\omega_2(\gamma) + Ce^{-c\gamma^2(\lambda^k r)^2}(\lambda^k r)^2 + Ce^{-c(\lambda^k r)^2} + C\lambda^{-k} r^{-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

The right hand side is decreasing in $k$ for fixed $\gamma$ and $r$ and we conclude that

$$\|Sv_0\|_{L^\infty(|x|\geq r)} \leq \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \|Sv_0\|_{L^\infty(A_{\lambda^k r})} \leq C\omega_1(\gamma) + C\omega_2(\gamma) + Ce^{-c\gamma^2 r^2} r^2 + Ce^{-cr^2} + Cr^{-1}.$$

If $q \in (3, \infty)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|Sv_0\|_{L^q(|x|\geq r)} &\leq C\|Sv_0\|^{1-3/q}_{L^\infty(|x|\geq r)}\|Sv_0\|^{3/q}_{L^3_w} \\ &\leq C(C\omega_1(\gamma) + C\omega_2(\gamma) + Ce^{-c\gamma^2 r^2}r^2 + Ce^{-cr^2} + Cr^{-1})^{1-3/q}\|v_0\|^{3/q}_{L^3_w}.\end{aligned}$$

We now construct $\Theta(r)$. Let $\epsilon_k = 2^{-k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $\epsilon_k$, choose $\gamma_k > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$C\omega_1(\gamma_k) + C\omega_2(\gamma_k) \leq \frac{\epsilon_k^{q/(q-3)}}{2C^{q/(q-3)}\|v_0\|^{3/(q-3)}_{L^3_w}}.$$

Then choose $r_k$ sufficiently large so that $r_k > r_{k-1}$ and

$$Ce^{-c\gamma_k^2 r_k^2}r_k^2 + Ce^{-cr_k^2} + Cr_k^{-1} \leq \frac{\epsilon_k^{q/(q-3)}}{2C^{q/(q-3)}\|v_0\|^{3/(q-3)}_{L^3_w}}.$$

Finally, let

$$\Theta(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 < r < r_1 \\ \epsilon_k & \text{if } r_k \leq r < r_{k+1} \end{cases},$$

which completes our proof. □

**Corollary 3.4.** *Assume $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$. Suppose $v_0 \in L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$ is RDSS with factor $\lambda > 1$ and phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\sup_{1\leq t\leq\lambda^2} Sv_0(t) \in L^q(\Omega)$ for every $q > 3$.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3. □

# 4 EP-solutions to Navier-Stokes equations

In this section we prove the main Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* We will focus on the RDSS case (ii).The RSS case (i) can be obtained either as limit of case (ii) as indicated in the comment after Theorem 1.3, following [4, §5.1], or proved directly in the time-independent setting, following [4, §5.2].

Assume $v_0$ is an RDSS divergence free vector field in $L^3_{w,\sigma}(\Omega)$, $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3_+\}$, with phase $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and factor $\lambda > 1$. Let $T = 2\log\lambda$ and choose $\alpha = \frac{\phi}{T}$ as in (1.29). Let $x, t, z, s$ satisfy (1.19) and let $y = R_\theta^T z$ and $\theta = \alpha s$. Let

$$U_0(y, s) = R_\theta^T\sqrt{t}Sv_0(x, t). \tag{4.1}$$

Compare this formula to (1.18) and (1.25). We now check that $U_0$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with (any) $q \in (3, \infty]$. Since $v_0$ is divergence free and RDSS, $Sv_0(x, t)$ is the divergence free, RDSS solution to the Stokes system (3.1) for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty)$. It follows that $U_0(y, s)$ is $T$-periodic, divergence free, and satisfies (2.3). Lemmas 3.2

and 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 guarantee that $U_0$ satisfies the function space inclusions in Assumption 2.1.

Let $u$ be the time-periodic weak solution of the Leray equations described in Theorem 2.3 with $U_0$ defined by (4.1) and $q = 10/3$. Let $v(x,t) = R_\theta u(y,s)/\sqrt{t}$. Then $v$ satisfies (1.31), the weak form of the Navier-Stokes equations.

It remains to show $v$ is an EP-solution. Observe that

$$v - Sv_0 \in L^\infty(1,\lambda^2; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(1,\lambda^2; H^1(\Omega)).$$

The $\lambda$-DSS scaling property implies

$$||v(t) - Sv_0(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim t^{1/2} \sup_{1\le\tau\le\lambda^2} ||v(\tau) - Sv_0(\tau)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

and

$$\int_0^{\lambda^2} \int ||\nabla(v(t) - Sv_0(t))||^2_{L^2}\, dx\, dt \lesssim \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-k}\right) \int_1^{\lambda^2} \int ||\nabla(v(t) - Sv_0(t))||^2_{L^2}\, dx\, dt.$$

It follows that

$$v - Sv_0 \in L^\infty(0,\lambda^2; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,\lambda^2; H^1(\Omega)). \tag{4.2}$$

By re-scaling, these bounds hold up to any finite time. Thus, $v$ is an EP-solution and the proof is complete. □

# 5 Appendix: Comments on the backward case

In this section we summarize known results and open problems in the backward case. For more details please see [11].

The classes of self-similar, RSS, DSS and RDSS solutions have their analog in the backward case, i.e., solutions of (1.1) for

$$-\infty < t < 0.$$

In the backward case, one replaces $t$ by $-t$ in the similarity transform (1.18)–(1.19) to set

$$v(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-t}} V(z,s), \quad \pi(x,t) = \frac{1}{-t}\Pi(z,s), \quad z = \frac{x}{\sqrt{-t}}, \quad s = \log(-t),$$

and changes the sign of $V + z\cdot\nabla_z V$ in (1.20) to get the *backward Leray equations*

$$\partial_s V + \frac{1}{2}V + \frac{z}{2}\cdot\nabla_z V - \Delta_z V + V\cdot\nabla_z V + \nabla_z \Pi = 0, \quad \nabla_z \cdot V = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

The class of backward self-similar solutions, with $V = V(z)$ independent of $s$, was proposed by Leray [17] in the whole space as a possible ansatz for singularity. Such

a possibility was excluded by [18] when one assumes $V \in L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$. A key ingredient in the proof of [18] is that the quantity (a modified "total head pressure")

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{2}|V|^2 + \Pi + \frac{1}{2} y \cdot V \tag{5.2}$$

satisfies the 1-sided maximal principle. The result of [18] was extended in [21] to exclude the cases $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $3 < q \le \infty$.

The result of [18] also follows from the later paper [6] by Escauriaza, Seregin, and Sverak, which says that any solution $v \in L^\infty(-1, 0; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$ is necessarily regular up to time 0. This result is extended in [19] to the half space. See [1] and its references for other extensions. This result of [6] can be also used to exclude RSS/DSS/RDSS solutions in the class $v \in L^\infty(-1, 0; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$, but it does not imply the result of [21]. The following remains open.

**Open Problem 5.1.** *Suppose $v(x, t)$ is a backward RSS/DSS/RDSS solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with*

$$|v(x, t)| \le \frac{C}{|x| + \sqrt{-t}} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0), \tag{5.3}$$

*does $v$ remain bounded up to time 0?*

The special case of RSS solutions of Perelman can be formulated as follows. (We could misunderstand since we did not communicate with Perelman directly.)

**Open Problem 5.2.** *Suppose $v(x, t)$ is a solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for $t < 0$ with*

$$v(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-t}} R(\alpha s) u(R(-\alpha s)\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}}), \quad s = \log(-t), \tag{5.4}$$

*for some $\alpha \neq 0$, and*

$$|u(y)| \le \frac{C}{|y| + 1} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{5.5}$$

*Are $v$ and $u$ identically zero?*

One can study $u(y)$ directly, which satisfies (5.5) and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha J u - \alpha J y \cdot \nabla u + \frac{1}{2} u + \frac{y}{2} \cdot \nabla u - \Delta_y u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Note that, for the above system with $\alpha \neq 0$, there does not seem an analogue quantity of $\Lambda$ that satisfies the maximal principle.

Regarding the half space, such solutions in the class $v \in L^\infty(-1, 0; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3_+))$ do not exist by [19], and nothing is known under the assumption (5.3). We formulate a problem.

**Open Problem 5.3.** *Suppose $v(x, t)$ is a solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (-\infty, 0)$ with zero boundary condition and*

$$v(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-t}} u(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}}), \tag{5.7}$$

*with $u(y)$ satisfying (5.5). Are $v$ and $u$ identically zero?*

# Acknowledgments

Part of this work was done when Z.B. was a postdoctoral fellow at the University of British Columbia. The research of both authors was partially supported by the NSERC grant 261356-13 (Canada). That of Z.B. was also partially supported by the NSERC grant 251124-12.

# References

[1] Barker, T. and Seregin G., A necessary condition of possible blowup for the Navier-Stokes system in half-space, arXiv:1508.05313

[2] Barraza, Oscar A. Self-similar solutions in weak $L^p$-spaces of the Navier-Stokes equations. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 12 (1996), no. 2, 411-439.

[3] M. E. Bogovskiĭ. Decomposition of $L^p(\Omega; R^n)$ into a direct sum of subspaces of solenoidal and potential vector fields. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 286(4):781-786, 1986.

[4] Bradshaw, Z. and Tsai, T.-P., Forward discretely self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations II, Annales Henri Poincare, to appear. (http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.07504).

[5] Cannone, M. and Planchon, F., Self-similar solutions for Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 21 (1996), no. 1-2, 179-193.

[6] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, and V. Sverak. On backward uniqueness for parabolic equations. Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI), 288(Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 32):100-103, 272, 2002.

[7] Giga, Y. and Kohn, R. V., Asymptotically self-similar blow-up of semilinear heat equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 38(3):297-319, 1985.

[8] Giga, Y. and Miyakawa, T., Navier-Stokes flows in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with measures as initial vorticity and the Morrey spaces, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 14 (1989), 577-618.

[9] Hishida, T., Mathematical analysis of the equations for incompressible viscous fluid around a rotating obstacle. Sugaku Expositions 26 (2013), no. 2, 149-179.

[10] Jia, H. and Šverák, V., Local-in-space estimates near initial time for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and forward self-similar solutions. Invent. Math. 196 (2014), no. 1, 233-265.

[11] Jia, H., Šverák, V. and Tsai, T.-P., Self similar solutions to the nonstationary Navier Stokes equations, a chapter in Handbook of Mathematical Analysis in Mechanics of Viscous Fluids, edited by Y. Giga and A. Novotny, Springer.

[12] Kato, T., Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in Morrey spaces. Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.) 22 (1992), no. 2, 127-155.

[13] Kikuchi, N. and Seregin, G., Weak solutions to the Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying the local energy inequality. Nonlinear equations and spectral theory, 141-164, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 220, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[14] Koch, H. and Tataru, D., Well-posedness for the Navier-Stokes equations. Adv. Math. 157 (1), 22–35 (2001)

[15] Korobkov, M. and Tsai, T.-P., Forward self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in the half space, Analysis and PDE, to appear. (http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.2516).

[16] Lemarié-Rieusset, P. G., *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem.* Chapman Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, 431. Chapman Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.

[17] Leray, J., Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. (French) Acta Math. 63 (1934), no. 1, 193-248.

[18] Nečas, J., Růžička, M., and Šverák, V., On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, Acta Math. 176 (1996), 283–294.

[19] Seregin, G. A., On smoothness of $L_{3,\infty}$-solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations up to boundary, Mathematische Annalen, 332(2005), pp. 219-238.

[20] Solonnikov, V. A., Estimates for solutions of the nonstationary Stokes problem in anisotropic Sobolev spaces and estimates for the resolvent of the Stokes operator. (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 58 (2003), no. 2(350), 123–156; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 58 (2003), no. 2, 331-365.

[21] Tsai, T.-P., On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying local energy estimates, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis 143 (1998), 29–51.

[22] Tsai, T.-P., Forward discretely self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. Comm. Math. Phys. 328 (2014), no. 1, 29-44.

[23] Ukai, S., A solution formula for the Stokes equation in $R^n_+$. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 40 (1987), no. 5, 611-621.

Zachary Bradshaw, Department of Mathematics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, 22904, USA; e-mail: zb8br@virginia.edu

Tai-Peng Tsai, Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, Canada; e-mail: ttsai@math.ubc.ca